

CHAPTER 10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

The citizens of Little Compton were actively involved in the preparation of this Comprehensive Plan. Their participation has been wide-ranging, from direct participation as members of the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee to responding to the citizen telephone survey to attending public workshops. The input has been invaluable to the planning process, and essential to the development of this Plan.

The following formal citizen participation activities were undertaken:

- Public Kickoff Meeting;
- Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee;
- Individual Element Advisory Committees;
- Citizen Attitude Survey (telephone); and,
- Public Workshops/Hearings.

The following summarizes the participation and results of these activities.

10.1 Public Kickoff Meeting

A kickoff meeting was conducted on December 12, 1989 in the Town Hall. Attending were approximately 110 invited guests and members of the public at-large. The kickoff meeting provided a background for the planning effort, outlined the seven required plan elements, discussed which organizations can best contribute to the effort, and started a list of interested residents to participate on the CAC.

10.2 Comprehensive Plan Citizens Advisory Committee

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and its subcommittees was comprised of approximately 100 participants representing various boards and committees, and the general public. Individuals representing the following boards/committees were involved with the CAC: Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Agricultural Conservancy Trust, Preservation Association, School Department, Police Department, Harbor Master and others. The following individuals participated in the Citizens Advisory Committee subcommittee process:

Plan Element	Member	Member
Housing	Larry Anderson Walt Bergman Ed Bullerjahn	George Flanagan Robert Hill Hydie Greene

Plan Element	Member	Member
	Marv Burchard Janice Clark Marjorie Connelly Joan Dennis Louise Eddy Beverly Edwards Charles Edwards Henry Laferriere, Leader	Helen Lvons Paul Manchester Liz Peckham Marge Phinney Dennis Talbot Douglas Whitmarsh William Whitmarsh
Economic Development	Janet Bowers Lillian Edwards Joel Flather Lynn Hutchins Chris Ingraham Bill Mackintosh Brett McKenzie, Leader William Bullivant, DI	Skip Paul Peter Ransom Earl Samson Clark Snow Mike Steers David Worgan Florence Worgan Kelly
Natural and Cultural Resources	Deborah Boddington-Sullivan Edward Bowen Betty Chase Peter D'Allesandro Joan Dennis Joe Domingos Beverly Edwards Junius Eddy, Leader Ted Fijak George Flanagan Mary Gordon Elinor Hough Boo Hubbard	Whitnev Jastram Mary Keeney Paul Pawlowski Frank Pond George Purmont Lucy O'Connor Ann Ransom John Telfeyan Luke Wallin Barbara Watson Florence Worgan Kelly
Services and Facilities	David Ahearn Julianna Bullerjahn Mary Burchard Edie Borden, Leader Ed Cissel John G. Faria Egbert Hawes, Jr. Marge Harrison Brad Hastings	Stephan Johnson William Makepeace Carl Mock Molly Taylor Phil Taylor Dutch Strawbridge Jim Truslow Jean Turcotte
Open Space and Recreation	David Borden Bob Bogle Ruth Bogle E. Bowen Clifford Cone Mary Gordon Gail Greene Hydie Greene Roger Green, Leader Marjorie Harrison Boo Hubbard Shay Lynch	Paul Manchester Ann Mackintosh Bill Mackintosh Lucy O'Connor Bill Richmond Mike Steers Bonnie Trowbridge Jim Truslow Luke Wallin Tyler Young Karla Young

Circulation	John Bowers Julianna Bullerjahn Mason Downing, Leader Mary Keeney Jean King A. Haffenreffer Egbert Hawes, Jr.	R. Greene Chip McLaughlin Lester Packard Miriam Scott Pauline Truslow Philip Taylor Vita Toms
Land Use	Peter D'Allesandro Rosemary Bowen Jean Brady Bill Burchard Clifford Cone Ward Dunn Jack Edwards Gabe Fart, Jr. George Flanagan Carl Fleming Roger Green Caroline Haffenreffer Margaret Kelly Florence Kelley	Nicholas Long Sheila Mackintosh John McKinnon Skip Paul Paul Pieri, Leader Bill Richmond Earl Samson Miriam Scott David Shwaery Richard Rogers Bonnie Trowbridge James Truslow Bill Westwater

The CAC was comprised of the group leaders and in some cases one other representative from each subcommittee, as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Eddie Borden, Services/Facilities | Brett McKenzie, Economic Development |
| Mason Downing, Circulation | Lester Packard, Circulation |
| Junius Eddy, Natural/Cultural | Paul Pieri, Land Use |
| Joel Flather, Economic Development | Frank Pond, Natural/Cultural |
| Roger Green, Recreation/Open Space | Richard Rogers, Land Use |
| Henry Laferriere, Housing | Jim Truslow, Services/Facilities |

The CAC was divided into seven groups, addressing land use, housing, economic development, natural and cultural resources, services and facilities, open space and recreation and circulation. The groups held open monthly meetings beginning in January, 1990, at which discussions on various topics regarding the Plan were held. Between January and February of 1990, the CAC met to set goals and priorities. From February through June, efforts were concentrated on preparing, administering and documenting the citizen telephone survey described later in this chapter. For the remainder of 1990 and the first half of 1991, the CAC subcommittees met sporadically to prepare the drafts of the individuals elements. In the fall of 1991, the CAC met with the Town Council to review the Plan's progress. Due to financing difficulties, progress was slow during 1992, and some element subcommittees continued to work on finalizing their sections. The Plan was largely complete by December, 1992.

The responsibilities of the CAC were to:

- collect and collate information based on local experience;
- review information presented by the planning consultant, Albert Veri & Associates, Inc.;
- contribute its own collective knowledge regarding a particular Plan element;
- interpret public input, and to distill that information into goals and implementation actions.

This information was available for public review at the Town Hall, Brownell Library and through CAC members throughout the planning process. The results of the CAC's efforts are presented as the body of this Comprehensive Plan.

10.3 Citizen Attitude Survey

The telephone survey for the Little Compton Comprehensive Plan was developed by Albert Veri & Associates, Inc. (AVA), and administered by more than 20 CAC members and other volunteers.

This summary describes the methodology and results of the citizen attitude survey conducted for the CAC (group leaders of individual subcommittees) by AVA. The survey was designed by AVA, with substantial input from the CAC and subcommittees. It was administered by volunteers drawn from the CAC and other Town residents and AVA staff, under the direction of AVA. The study was designed to assist the committees and Planning Board in developing the Comprehensive Plan. The survey was conducted over a two week period from March 19 through March 29, 1989.

Interviewers - The administration of the survey was the responsibility of AVA and the CAC, which recruited volunteer interviewers who were oriented by AVA staff prior to participating in the survey. Interviews were completed under the direct observation and supervision of AVA.

Respondents - A total of 383 Little Compton residents were interviewed for this study. The sample consisted of year round residents and summer residents. The sample was designed by AVA, using randomly selected sample points from the Town's tax records. Seasonal residents were likewise selected, although telephone numbers were of their permanent homes outside Little Compton. The specific individuals selected to be

interviewed were chosen at random in a manner which gave each Little Compton resident included in the list an equal opportunity to be included in the survey. Screening questions were asked prior to proceeding with an interview, ensuring that those interviewed were at least 18 years old. Interviewers were given telephone numbers only in order to protect the confidentiality of the survey.

Reliability - The margin of error for a sample of 383 with a population of approximately 3,850 people is 3 percent at the 95 percent confidence interval. A 3 percent error means that the results of the study are within 3 percentage points either way of that which would have been obtained had all Little Compton residents been interviewed.

Questionnaire - The final questionnaire consisted of 53 items. The questions asked were of two types closed-ended and open-ended, with three being of the open-ended variety. Sixteen of the items were of a demographic nature. The questionnaire and the frequency distributions of the responses are included as Appendix A.

A cross tabular analysis was conducted on various questions in order to further clarify how different groups respond stand on various issues. The questions used in the analysis were of a demographic nature and included: question #2 pertaining to tenure, question #4 pertaining to origin, question #42 age of respondent, question #43 household income, and question #51 educational level achieved. A cross tabular analysis was done with other questions which AVA thought might have a strong relationship to one another. These include: questions #25 and #26 on zoning enforcement and the zoning ordinance, questions #15 and #48 on the affordable housing issue and the number of elderly in a household, questions #10 and #44 school rating and the number children in a household, question #18, #24 and #44 pertaining to the community center, the library and the number of children in a household.

10.3.a Profile of the Residents

The typical Little Compton adult is a year round resident, has lived in the Town for more than 20 years, has a college degree or has some college experience, owns the home in which they live and considers themselves to be a professional.

Residence - About a quarter (24 %) of the respondents have lived in the Town all their lives, twenty eight percent came to Little Compton from other Towns in Rhode Island, and close to a quarter (23 %) came from other parts of New England. A significant

number of those surveyed were seasonal residents, nearly twenty six percent. The percentages mentioned above have been adjusted to reflect the number of seasonal residents who, were not asked about their residence prior to moving to Little Compton.

Income - More than a quarter (27%) of the residents have an income of \$60,000 or more, one of six (15%) have income between \$15,000 and \$30,000, approximately one in five (19%) have income between \$30,000 and \$45,000, and more than one in seven (13%) have income between \$45,000 and \$60,000 annually.

Employment - One in five (21%) residents works in the Town, while the remainder is well-divided between other cities and towns in Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

Education - Over a quarter (28%) of the respondents have college degrees, twenty percent have graduate degrees and around the same number have some college, close to another quarter (24%) have received their high school diploma.

Family size and Household size - Approximately one half (48%) of the those interviewed have children currently living in their households, and of these households most have either one or two children. Thirty percent of those interviewees with children in their households have children under 6 years old, and close to two thirds (62%) have children between the ages of 6 and 18, and eight percent have children over the age of 18 living at home. Thirty eight percent of the children attend school in Little Compton. There were 1,092 people comprising the 383 households surveyed, of this number fourteen percent were age 65 or older. The average household size of those surveyed was 2.85 persons.

Spatial distribution - Respondents were asked to identify the area of Little Compton in which they currently live. The choices given included, Adamsville, Commons Area, Sakonnet Point Area or, other. The majority (55%) indicated "other", that they lived outside of the three specific areas mentioned above, sixteen percent indicated the Adamsville area, fifteen percent stated that they resided in the Sakonnet Point area, and twelve percent resided in the vicinity of the Commons. Many of those who answered "other", gave street names or vague generalizations describing the area in which they live. Eight percent of those interviewed, indicated the South Shore area as their place of residence. Another ten percent gave street names in the South Shore area, and were therefore included in the South Shore count. Eight percent gave the names of streets in

the western part of Town, or simply stated that they lived in the western part of Town. Six percent of the respondents live on Long Highway, running close to the length of Town from north to south, and generally east of the geographic center. Two percent stated that they lived in the eastern part of Town. Approximately another three percent indicated the Windmill Hill area, in the north-western part of Town, to be their place of residence within Little Compton. The remaining nineteen percent either had "no answer", gave a street name not found within the Town border or, gave too vague a generalization of their location to be placed in any specific area of Town.

10.3.b Attitudes on Town Tentage

Respondents presented a clear picture of the things that make Little Compton an enjoyable place to live. It was more difficult to determine what residents found objectionable about the Town. Responses varied widely, and no distinct characteristic dominated the range of responses. To identify views on the image of the Town, respondents were asked what they liked best about Little Compton, and then which features they found the least desirable. Only two of the 383 persons interviewed was not able to identify a specific feature which they liked best about the Town, an unusually large number of positive responses to an open-ended question. Conversely, a large number of people (94) could not identify a feature which they found to be objectionable.

Specific Features Named by Respondents - The greatest percentage of those interviewed, thirty-two percent, alluded to the quiet, peace, seclusion and private nature of the Town as the feature which they liked best. Almost another third (30%) said it was the rural, country, farming nature of the Town which was the most attractive. Close to eleven percent alluded to features related to the Towns proximity to the ocean, words such as seaside, shore, beaches were used in describing this favored feature. Nine percent identified the aesthetic quality of the Town as the feature they liked best, using words such as beauty, visual, and clean. Mother nine percent mentioned community spirit or, the people, as the best feature of the Town. Around five percent of those responding liked the fact that they had grown-up and, had lived all there lives in Town, creating a feeling of nostalgia.

The highest percentage (25%) of those interviewed had no complaints regarding the town and its features. Thirteen percent identified growth development, progress and the congestion normally associated with these elements to be the feature which they found the most objectionable. Nine percent of those interviewed had complaints with political

fighting in Town government. Eight percent had complaints about traffic and roads in general. A little over six percent of respondents had complaints about summer residents. The remaining negative features were identified less than three percent of the time. Thirteen percent of the respondents did not provide an answer for this question.

Image of Town Services - Town services were rated "good" by the highest percentage of those responding, indicating that residents are generally satisfied with services. Without exception, most residents rated Town services to be either good or excellent. One in three respondents (32%) were unfamiliar with the Town's school system.

Four rating categories, "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," and "Poor" were consolidated into two, either "Positive" or, "Negative." The percentage of respondents rating services "Excellent" or, "Good" are found under the heading "Rated Positive" and, the percentage of respondents rating services "Fair" or "Poor" are found under the heading "Rated Negative."

	Rated Positive	Rated Negative
Fire	83%	5%
Police	81%	13 %
Roads	62%	34 %
Schools *	51%	14 %
Town Government	61%	26%

* Represents 68% of the respondents who expressed an opinion.

Services needed or in need of expansion:

Road maintenance - Road maintenance was the one area rated as "poor" by more than 5 percent of the respondents (8.6 % rated "poor").

Community Center - Approximately seventy-three percent of the interviewees thought the Town should provide a community center (Q-18). People in households having more than two children were more likely to be in favor of a community center than those with no children or just one child. The age of children in a household did not have a strong correlation with support for a community center. Those people with no children were the least likely to support for a community center, although the vast majority in each category did show support for them.

Library Services - When asked if it was important to improve and expand library services and facilities (Q-24) seventy-eight percent responded affirmatively. People in households having more than two children were more likely to be in favor of expanded library services and facilities than those with no children or just one child. Once again, the age of children in a household did not have a strong correlation with support for these services and people with no children were the least likely to show support .

10.3.c Housing

Low and moderate income housing: The results of survey were inconclusive as to the importance of low and moderate income housing to Little Compton residents. However, elderly housing was supported by a strong majority (67%). The impressions of respondents relative to affordable housing were determined by asking if they think the Town should encourage the creation of low and moderate income housing, and by inquiring whether or not they knew of anyone who had to move because they could not afford to live in Town (Q-14, Q-17). Forty seven percent of the respondents did not believe that the Town should encourage low and moderate income housing, while forty percent agreed that the Town should encourage low and moderate income housing.

The data were factored for age of respondent, for length of residence in the town and for income. Persons aged 55-64 were more likely to be in favor of the affordable housing for low and moderate income people. The tenure of a resident did seem to have a strong correlation with the affordable housing issue. People who lived in Town for 6-10 years were more likely to agree that the Town should encourage affordable housing, while those residing in the Town for more than 20 years were much more likely to disagree on this point. People who lived in Town all their lives were less likely to agree that the Town should encourage affordable housing for low and moderate income people, while those moving to the Town from other New England states were more likely to support affordable housing in the Town. People in households earning above \$45,000, viewed the affordable housing issue to be of less importance, than did those making less. The majority of people in households earning over \$45,000 did not agree that the Town should encourage the creation of low and moderate income housing while those making less had the majority in favor of low and moderate income initiatives.

Cost of Living factor - Almost a third of the respondents (29%) knew of someone who had to move from the Town because the cost of living was too high. Sixty three

percent could not recall an instance where someone was forced to move because of the cost of living in Town.

Housing for the elderly - More than two-thirds (67%) of those interviewed would encourage the Town to create housing for the elderly. The data were factored for age of respondent, for length of residence in the town and for income. Analysis of the cross tabulation revealed people aged 30-44 were more likely to agree that the Town should encourage the creation of housing for the elderly. The tenure of a resident did not have a significant bearing on elderly housing issue. People living in Little Compton all their lives were most likely to be in favor of Town encouraged elderly housing, while those moving to Town from other parts of Rhode Island were least likely to agree with this initiative. A person's income did have a strong correlation with regard to this issue. People in households earning more than \$60,000 were far less likely to agree that the Town should encourage elderly housing, while respondents in the lowest income group showed the greatest support for elderly housing.

Mobile Homes - Close to two-thirds (62%) disagreed, when asked if the Town should amend its zoning ordinance to allow mobile homes in designated areas. Since mobile homes are now permitted by right through out the Town, the question regarding this type of housing may have been misinterpreted. To respond negatively to the question may imply that the respondent does not want mobile homes restricted only to "designated" parts of Town but would want them throughout the Town. However, the cross tabular analysis would suggest otherwise; that people responded negatively when they were actually opposed to mobile homes. The data were factored for age of respondent, for length of residence in the town for income, and for level of completed education. The mobile home issue produced some interesting results in the cross-tabular analysis. People aged 45-54 were the most likely to disagree that the Town should change the zoning ordinance to allow mobile homes, and the next age cohort (55-64) was the group most likely to be in favor of allowing mobile homes in Town. Residents who have lived in Town for the least amount of time showed the most opposition to allowing mobile homes. Respondents in the highest household income groups (\$45-\$60,000 and \$60,000 +) disagreed with the greatest frequency on the issue of mobile homes. Those in the lowest two income groups had an equal number on each side of the issue. Those people with college or post graduate degrees, disagreed by the greatest majority when asked the question pertaining to mobile homes.

10.3.d Schools

Although a large percentage of those interviewed had no knowledge of the Town's school system because they had no children, it is important to take a closer look at the attitudes of residents on this subject. Respondents with more than one child were more likely to have negative attitudes about the school system, especially those with older children. Residents who have lived in Town for more than ten years were more apt to rate the school system favorably than were those who had been in Town for fewer than ten years. People with fewer than ten years of tenure in the Town were more likely to rate the school "poor," however, a small percentage of these have children. Generally, people with college or graduate degrees had the highest level of dissatisfaction with the school system. In both cases, the majority rated the school system as being "poor" whereas, people with less education, had a majority ranking the school system as being "good." Older people seemed to possess the greatest dissatisfaction with the school system. The highest percentage of those above age 55 rated the school system poorly, as opposed to those below age 55 who, had the highest percentage rating the school system "good." The highest percentage of respondents to rate the school system poorly were those in the \$60,000 + household income bracket, while the highest percentage of those earning less than \$60,000 rated the school system "good."

10.3.e Traffic Safety

When asked to indicate the names of any streets and intersections in Little Compton which are traffic safety problems, 131 respondents, or about 34% of those surveyed indicated that there were no streets or intersections that they considered traffic safety problems.

Among those who indicated that they were problems, many cited more than one street or intersection and many gave vague generalizations. Most of the problems were seen at intersections as opposed to citing whole streets or roads. The analysis below indicates the frequency of the intersections and streets cited among all respondents.

Vague generalizations were recorded 24 times. The statements typically cited, "only in the summer," to "all intersections need stop signs," to "there are problems, but I can't think of any now." Among those who identified specific streets and intersections, the most concern was expressed about traffic in the Commons area. In one form or another the Commons was cited 55 times. Traffic issues around the Commons can be categorized as follows:

- traffic around the Commons in general;
- traffic near the Post Office; and,
- traffic at Willow Avenue, Simmons Road and South Commons Road.

The intersection cited as the worst is Long Highway and Peckham Road (47 mentions), followed by the corner of Long Highway and Colebrook Road (cited 28 times) just to the north. The intersection receiving the next largest number of mentions is also just west of Long Highway/Peckham Road, at Peckham Road and East Main Road.

The following intersections are also considered problematic, listed by number of mentions (high to low) West Main Road/Warren's Point Road/Sakonnet Point Road; John Dyer Road at Pottersville Road and Mullin Hill Road; Long Highway at Pottersville Road; Long Highway at Snell Road; Adamsville - general vicinity; West Main Road at Swamp Road; West Main Road at Peckham Road; Peckham Road at Willow Avenue; East Main Road at Snell Road; East Main Road/Maple Avenue at Simmons Road; Peckham Road at Burchard Avenue; Maple Avenue at Brownell Road; Old Main Road at Windmill Hill; John Sisson Road at South Shore Road; John Dyer Road at Colebrook Road; Maple Avenue at South Shore Road; West Main Road at Town Way; and Swamp Road at Long Pasture Road.

In terms of citing entire roads or streets, very few were actually mentioned. Most respondents focused on intersections. Among those mentioned, the problem streets tend to be Long Highway, Peckham Road, Pottersville Road, and to some extent West Main Road, particularly to the south as it turns into Warren Point's Road and Sakonnet Point Road.

10.3.f Development - Economic Development and Natural Resources

A wide range of questions pertaining to development were asked of respondents, including the attitudes of residents relative to preservation and conservation of farms, commercial and industrial development, development on the Commons, improvement of Sakonnet Harbor, and tourism.

Farmland Conservation and Preservation - The vast majority of respondents, 96 and 95 percent respectively, believed historic and farmland preservation were important.

Question 13 asks respondents to rate the Town's performance with regard to conservation and preservation of farmland. Almost half of those surveyed indicated the Town was doing a good job in this area, one in five people believed the Town was doing an excellent job and another one in five said the Town was doing a fair to poor job.

Commercial and Industrial development - The vast majority (71%) thought it unimportant for the Town to allow industrial development in designated parts of Town and, only fifty-five percent thought it important to allow limited commercial development in designated parts of Town. People in the highest income range were the only ones who did not think it important to allow some limited commercial growth in Town. This group also had the greatest majority opposing industrial development and tourism. Residents who have a graduate degree opposed limited commercial development by a majority, while all other educational groups were in favor of it by a majority. Those respondents with at least a college degree, were opposed to industrial development by the greatest percentage.

Tourism - Less than a quarter of the respondents felt it was important for the Town to promote tourism. Respondents with the greatest tenure were less likely to be in favor of tourism.

Development on the Commons - Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding the Commons in an attempt to determine the level of satisfaction with which this area functions and if the aesthetic quality needs to be monitored.

The vast majority (73%) of those interviewed were opposed to the approval of new commercial development on the Commons (Q-34). Even more (76%), were in favor of imposing an exterior design review process for buildings on the Commons. The majority (67%) was opposed to a reduction of on-street parking in favor of municipal lots in the Commons area. People in the highest income groups expressed the greatest opposition to new commercial development in the Commons. Eighty-two percent of those interviewed in the \$45,000 to \$60,000 range and seventy-six percent of those in the \$60,000 + range were opposed, whereas in the lower income groups approximately seventy percent were opposed. Level of education did not have a strong relationship with the question of whether or not limited commercial development should be allowed on the Commons. Education did however, seem to influence respondents with regard to the design review and parking question. People with at least a college degree were in favor of design review by a considerably higher percentage than were people without a college degree. Respondents in the two highest educational brackets, opposed the change in parking schemes at the Commons by the greatest majority. People 55 and

older had the smallest majority to oppose the reduction of on-street parking in favor of parking lots.

The responses to these questions would indicate that people are satisfied with the Commons the way it is, and are concerned about protecting its visual quality. Questions on the Commons elicited a high response rate, typically less than four percent of those surveyed did not have an opinion on these questions. It was noted in other responses that the majority would favor the Town using its power of eminent domain to acquire land for new facilities such as a fire station, new school and recreational facilities, and parking.

Sakonnet Harbor - Generally, the vast majority of respondents agreed that services and facilities in and around Sakonnet Harbor should be improved. Questions on Sakonnet Harbor had a lower response rate than did questions on the Commons, an average of over eight percent did not have an opinion on the statements concerning the Harbor.

Sixty-three percent agreed that the Town should impose a user fee on all boat owners to finance Town services at the harbor (Q-38). Seventy-four percent agreed that the Town should acquire additional land at Sakonnet Harbor for public parking and pedestrian access (Q-39). Seventy-one percent were of the opinion that the Town should install a boat septic system "pump-out" facility to improve water quality in the harbor (Q-40). Fifty-five percent of those interviewed agreed that the Town should increase the number of moorings in the harbor if safety, environmental and legal requirements are met (Q-41). The data were factored for income, length of residence in the town, and age. Respondents in the highest income group differed from the other income groups in regard to the Sakonnet Harbor. People in the \$60,000 plus income bracket were less likely to support the Town's acquisition of land to improve the parking and public access at the Harbor. Tenure did not seem to have a strong correlation with the imposition of users fees at the Harbor, although people who had lived in Town for more than twenty years were apt to be against user fees. There does, however, appear to be a correlation between the willingness of a resident to support an increase in moorings and tenure. Those residents with eleven or more years of tenure were in favor of increasing mooring space by the smallest majority. People 18-44 were more likely to support a "pump-out" facility at Sakonnet Harbor than were people in the higher age brackets. The level of education

attained by a respondent did not have a strong relationship with questions related to Sakonnet Harbor.

10.3.g Regulations

A number of questions were aimed at eliciting residents' attitudes about the performance of the Town Council and other boards, and about zoning in the Town.

Town Council, Town Boards and Town Regulations - Questions #12, and #25 through 30 attempt to determine attitudes regarding various regulations, and about the functions of boards and the Town Council. For question #12, better than half (52%) rated the Town either "good" or "excellent" with regard to planning and zoning, thirty-two percent rated the Town "fair" or "poor". Eight percent rated planning and zoning "excellent", an equal number rated it "poor".

Zoning Enforcement and Zoning Ordinance - In general, there seems to be more concern about the enforcement of the ordinance than about the ordinance itself. Forty percent rated zoning enforcement "about right," thirty-one percent believed that enforcement was not strict enough, and eight percent saw it as being too strict. A significant number did not know how to rate zoning enforcement (20%). A high number in this category would be expected as many people have not had the occasion to be involved with zoning violations.

Question #26 dealt with the zoning ordinance itself. More than half (53%) were of the opinion that the zoning ordinance was "about right," eighteen percent indicated it was "not strict enough," and eleven percent said it was "too strict." Again, a high percentage (15%) of the respondents did not know how to rate the zoning ordinance.

There is a greater percentage of those persons who believe the ordinance and enforcement are too strict versus those who feel enforcement is lacking and the ordinance is not strict enough. Almost half of those who indicated enforcement is not strict enough felt that the ordinance itself is not strong enough, whereas forty percent of those respondents felt that the ordinance is about right. One third of those who indicating the ordinance was about right, felt that enforcement was too strict, and a much smaller percentage indicated that the ordinance was too strict and enforcement was about right.

The data were factored for income and for level of completed education. People in the upper income groups were more likely to believe that enforcement was not strict enough while those in the lowest income had the highest percentage who felt that enforcement was too strict. The same tendency was found with regard to the ordinance itself. Education seemed to have some bearing on whether a respondent indicated enforcement and the ordinance were too strict or not strict enough. People with the least amount of education were most apt to find the zoning ordinance too strict and conversely those with the most education felt the ordinance was not strict enough.

Zoning Jurisdiction - The results of questions #27 and #28 indicate that the majority of residents believe that the Planning and Zoning Boards, not the Town Council, should have the authority to approve subdivisions, zoning variances and exceptions. Fifty-three percent of the respondents would favor a change in the Town's ordinance allowing the Planning Board to approve subdivisions, and fifty-eight percent would favor a change in current practice, shifting authority from the Council to the Zoning Board of Review with regard to requests for approvals of variances and special exceptions. Once again a high percentage of those surveyed did not know how to respond to these questions (twelve and eighteen percent respectively). The results of questions #27 and #28 might indicate that residents prefer to take zoning and subdivision questions out of the political arena.

Town Manager - The results of the survey were inconclusive with regard to changing the current system of to one run by a professional Town Manager. Forty-seven percent would oppose a change which would have a professional Town Manager in charge of the day to day operations. Thirty-six percent of those interviewed would prefer a professional Town Manager, over a government run by an elected body. Fourteen percent did not know how to answer this question. People with college or graduate degrees were more apt to favor the hiring of a professional Town Manager, than were people without college degrees. Those without college degrees opposed, by a small majority, the hiring of a Town Manager.

Eminent Domain - The majority (56%) of respondents agreed that the Town should exercise its power of eminent domain in order to acquire lands for legitimate public purposes.

10.3.h Water Quality Protection

Questions #31-33 attempt to determine if residents believe that the Town should be more involved in matters of water supply protection. The majority of those interviewed agreed that the Town should monitor all percolation and water table tests (Q-31, fifty-five percent), should test and record all water wells (Q- 32, fifty-four percent), and should develop a program to periodically test and pump out private septic systems to protect ground water (Q-33, fifty percent). The percentages of those disagreeing are as follows: question 31, thirty-eight percent, question 32, forty percent, and question 33, forty-one percent. Generally, it was found that people in the higher age groups were less likely to support Town involvement in these matters. People aged 55-64 had a majority oppose Town involvement in the testing of water wells, and in the pumping and testing of septic systems. With the exception of question #32, regarding Town testing and recording of all water wells, higher income people were generally more likely to support Town involvement in water quality matters. However, the correlation is not a especially strong in this area. Like wise, a respondents educational back ground proved to have little significance with regard to the Towns involvement in water quality monitoring. It can be said however, that respondents with some college, or those that have a college degree are more likely to favor Town involvement than those who have less education but also, more than those with graduate degrees. A stronger correlation exists with these issues and a residents tenure. Residents who have lived in Town for more than twenty years were the only group to oppose, by a majority, Town involvement in well monitoring and septic tank testing and maintenance, residents with less tenure were more likely to be in favor of Town involvement.

10.4 Public Workshops

The CAC held 10 public workshops to present draft goals and recommendations and to hear the concerns of Town residents regarding planning issues. From 10 to 90 people attended these element-specific workshops which were held over the course of three years (1990-1993). Input received at the workshops was used to refine the Plan's goals and recommendations.